



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,668	04/21/2004	Igor Waysbeyn	H308-001-PAT	4917
83380 7590 07/17/2009 William H. Dippert Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC U.S. Steel Tower 600 Grant Street, 44th Floor Pittsburgh, PA 15219				
EXAMINER MILLER, CHERYL L				
ART UNIT 3738		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 07/17/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ipmail@eckertseamans.com

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/828,668

Applicant(s)

WAYSBEYN ET AL.

Examiner

CHERYL MILLER

Art Unit

3738

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) CHERYL MILLER (Examiner).(3) Irina Kavounovski.(2) William Dippert (Reg No.26,723).(4) Marganit Goldraich.

Date of Interview: 13 July 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: brief slideshow and model of prior art stent graft and of the current device.

Claim(s) discussed: New independent.

Identification of prior art discussed: Art applied in previous office action.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussion of possible amendment to require the graft to be stentless seemingly overcomes the Fogarty and Baker rejections. The rejection of Elliot may require further consideration. Applicant plans to file a supplemental amendment in response to the discussion which will be entered and considered at that point in time.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Cheryl Miller/
Examiner, Art Unit 3738